

## REMARKS

The amendments to the specification are supported by claim 30, Figure 1, as well as the description of Figure 1. Figure 5 is supported by Figure 1. No new matter has been added. Acceptance of the new figure is respectfully requested.

The amendment to claim 30 is supported by claim 31. Other claims have been clarified, or made consistent with amended claim 30. Claims 41 and 48 are supported by claim 22. Claim 42 is supported by original claims 30 and 31. Claims 43-47 are supported by claims 36-40, respectively. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 30 and 33-48 are present and active in the application.

The rejections of claims 30 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 has been obviated by appropriate amendment. Claim 31 has been incorporated into the independent claims. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph, are respectfully traversed. Many examples of devices for purifying water, as well as how to make and use these devices, are provided in the specification. Furthermore, no "essential elements" are missing from the claims.

The specification, in paragraphs [0013], [0023], [0026], [0028], [0035]-[0038] and [0044] describe how to make and use a device for purifying water. Examples of a device for purifying water included a membrane with the colloids immobilized thereon (see paragraphs [0028] and [0044]), colloids contained in a nylon mesh bag (see paragraph [0028]), and a container such as a glass jar containing the colloids (see paragraph [0037]). New Figure 5 illustrates a type of glass jar (a beaker). Applicants submit that the claimed invention is fully enabled by the specification of the present application.

No critical or essential elements have been omitted from the claims, and the claims are not incomplete. As stated in M.P.E.P. 2164.08:

In determining whether an unclaimed feature is critical, the entire disclosure must be considered. Features which are merely preferred are not to be considered critical. *In re Goffe*, 542 F.2d 564, 567, 191 USPQ 429, 431 (CCPA 1976).

Limiting an applicant to the preferred materials in the absence of limiting prior art would not serve the constitutional purpose of promoting

the progress in the useful arts. Therefore, an enablement rejection based on the grounds that a disclosed critical limitation is missing from a claim should be made only when the language of the specification makes it clear that the limitation is critical for the invention to function as intended. Broad language in the disclosure, including the abstract, omitting an allegedly critical feature, tends to rebut the argument of criticality.

Accordingly, no essential nor critical features have been omitted from the claims. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

The objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) is respectfully traversed. Applicants have added Figure 5, which is simply the illustration of the beaker and the colloid from Figure 1. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The objection to the specification has been obviated by addition of the language of claim 30 to the specification. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. Early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Evan Law Group LLC  
566 West Adams  
Suite 350  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 876-1400

Respectfully submitted,



Paul E. Rauch, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 38,591

## **IN THE FIGURES**

Please add the attached new figure, Figure 5.